



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/630,940	07/31/2003	Bruce H. Hanson	FS-00900	1862
7055 7590 11/28/2008 GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C. 1950 ROLAND CLARKE PLACE RESTON, VA 20191				
EXAMINER HAGEMAN, MARK				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3653				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
11/28/2008		ELECTRONIC		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

gbpatent@gbpatent.com  
pto@gbpatent.com

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
AND INTERFERENCES

---

*Ex parte* BRUCE H. HANSON and MICHAEL WISNIEWSKI

---

Appeal 2008-2403  
Application 10/630,940  
Technology Center 3600

---

Decided: November 25, 2008

---

Before LINDA E. HORNER, JOHN C. KERINS, and  
STEVEN D.A. MCCARTHY, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

HORNER, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION ON APPEAL  
STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Bruce H. Hanson and Michael Wisniewski (Appellants) seek our review under 35 U.S.C. § 134 of the final rejection of claims 1-23. We have jurisdiction under 35 U.S.C. § 6(b) (2002).

## SUMMARY OF DECISION

We REVERSE.

### THE INVENTION

The Appellants' claimed invention is to a sequencing system and method for increasing machine capacity and throughput of mail pieces such as packages, flats, mixed mail and the like (Spec. 6:17-20). Claim 1, reproduced below, is representative of the subject matter on appeal.

1. A system for sequencing products,  
comprising:

a plurality of input feeding devices each  
randomly receiving product from a stream of  
product;

a plurality of output groups each having a  
plurality of output bins; and

a control system having a mode which  
constrains the input feeding devices to (i) feeding  
non-rejected product to output bins of assigned  
output groups of the plurality of output groups  
associated with a corresponding one of the  
plurality of input feeding devices, and (ii) feeding  
rejected product to at least one output bin of the  
plurality of output bins in a single group accessible  
to any of the plurality of input feeders.

### THE REJECTIONS

The Examiner relies upon the following as evidence of unpatentability:

De Leo	US 6,107,588	Aug. 22, 2000
Walach	US 6,274,836 B1	Aug. 14, 2001
DeWitt	US 2002/0104782 A1	Aug. 8, 2002

The Appellants seek our review of the following rejections made by the Examiner:

1. Claims 1-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over De Leo and DeWitt.
2. Claims 1-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Walach and DeWitt.

### ISSUE

The Appellants contend that DeWitt discloses a single input feeding device with a corresponding output bin and does not disclose any embodiment in which “any of a plurality of feeding devices can feed rejected product to at least one output bin of the plurality of output bins in a single group accessible to any of the plurality of input feeders.” App. Br. 8. The Examiner found that “De Witt discloses (ii) feeding rejected product to at least one output bin (250) of the plurality of output bins in a single group accessible to any of the plurality of input feeders (460) for the purpose of separating items which have been misread or partially read from those that have been properly processed (para. 105).” Ans. 3.

The issue before us is:

Have the Appellants shown that the Examiner erred in finding that DeWitt discloses a plurality of feeding devices that can feed rejected product to at least one output bin in a single group accessible to any of the plurality of input feeders?

### FINDINGS OF FACT

We find that the following enumerated findings are supported by at least a preponderance of the evidence. *Ethicon, Inc. v. Quigg*, 849 F.2d 1422, 1427 (Fed. Cir. 1988) (explaining the general evidentiary standard for proceedings before the Office).

1. DeWitt discloses a system and method for extracting, re-ordering, re-orienting, imaging, and sorting remittance transactions. DeWitt 1:¶0002.
2. DeWitt discloses a fully-automated embodiment, as depicted in Figures 1-18, and a semi-automated embodiment, as depicted in Figures 19-22. DeWitt 3:¶¶0018-0045 and 16:¶¶0156, 0157.
3. The fully-automated embodiment includes an imaging section 200 that includes a reject bin 250. DeWitt, Fig. 14.
4. DeWitt discloses that a magnetic ink character recognition (“MICR”) character reader 220 magnetically reads the MICR line on checks. DeWitt also discloses that it may be desirable to use an imaging reader to verify the results from the MICR character reader 220, and if there is a mismatch between the optically read

MICR line and the results from the MICR character reader 220, the documents from that transaction are directed to the reject bin 250.  
DeWitt 9-10:¶¶0097-0098.

5. DeWitt further discloses that if the documents are out of order, i.e., check/invoice order rather than invoice/check order, then the documents in the transaction are directed to the reject bin 250.  
DeWitt: 6:¶0069.

6. The semi-automated embodiment includes a plurality of drop chutes 460 and an imaging device 480 that scans the document to obtain image data relating to the documents. DeWitt: 16:¶0159.

7. DeWitt discloses that “[f]rom the imaging device, the documents are conveyed to one or more output bins 490.” DeWitt 16:¶0159.

8. DeWitt further discloses:

The imaging device 480 scans the image of each document and transfers the image data to the controller 415. If a MICR module is included, the MICR line on each check is identified and decoded. Then, if desired, a printer prints information on each document, such as the batch number and the sequential document number identifying each document in the batch. The documents are then conveyed to a plurality of output bins 495, and if desired, a plurality of gates 496 sorts the documents into the different bins according to document-type or transaction-type.

DeWitt 19:¶0192.

9. DeWitt does not disclose that the imaging device 480 of the semi-automated embodiment includes a reject bin or is able to access

reject bin 250 of the fully-automated embodiment and does not disclose, for example, using an imaging reader to verify the results from an MICR character reader 220 such that mismatches would be sent to a reject bin, as in the fully-automated embodiment described above.

10. Thus, DeWitt does not disclose feeding rejected product to at least one output bin 250 of a plurality of output bins in a single group accessible to any of a plurality of input feeders 460.

#### PRINCIPLES OF LAW

In rejecting claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), the examiner bears the initial burden of establishing a prima facie case of obviousness. *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 1445 (Fed. Cir. 1992); *see also In re Piasecki*, 745 F.2d 1468, 1472 (Fed. Cir. 1984). “Section 103 forbids issuance of a patent when ‘the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.’” *KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 127 S. Ct. 1727, 1734 (2007). The question of obviousness is resolved on the basis of underlying factual determinations including (1) the scope and content of the prior art, (2) any differences between the claimed subject matter and the prior art, (3) the level of skill in the art, and (4) where in evidence, so-called secondary considerations. *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 17-18 (1966). *See also KSR*, 127 S. Ct. at 1734 (“While the

sequence of these questions might be reordered in any particular case, the [*Graham*] factors continue to define the inquiry that controls.”)

### ANALYSIS

The Examiner’s rejection of claims 1-23 is based on the combination of the teachings of De Leo or Walach in view of DeWitt. Independent claim 1 is directed to a system for sequencing products that includes “a control system having a mode which constrains the input feed devices to ... (ii) feeding rejected product to at least one output bin of the plurality of output bins in a single group accessible to any of the plurality of input feeders.” Independent claim 15 is directed to a method of sequencing product that includes the step of “feeding, in the second pass phase, rejected product of the plurality of product to an output bin common and accessible to any of the input devices.” Independent claim 21 is also to a system for sequencing products that includes “means for permitting, in the second pass phase, rejected product of the plurality of product to an output bin common and accessible to any of the feeding means.”

As noted by the Examiner, neither De Leo nor Walach discloses feeding rejected product to at least one output bin of the plurality of output bins in a single group accessible to any of the plurality of input feeders, as required in claims 1, 15, and 21. Ans. 3, 10-11. The Examiner relied on DeWitt for this teaching and found that DeWitt’s drop chutes 460 are capable of accessing its reject bin 250. Ans. 3, 11. We disagree with this finding by the Examiner. DeWitt does not disclose that the reject bin 250 of



Appeal No. 2008-2403  
Appl. No. 10/630,940

the first, fully-automated embodiment of DeWitt, is accessible to the drop chutes 460 of the second, semi-automated embodiment of DeWitt (Facts 9-10). Thus, the Examiner erred in rejecting claims 1, 15, and 21, and their respective dependent claims 2-14, 16-20 and 22-23, as unpatentable over De Leo or Walach in view of DeWitt.

### CONCLUSION

We conclude that the Appellants have demonstrated error in the Examiner's finding that DeWitt discloses a plurality of feeding devices that can feed rejected product to at least one output bin in a single group accessible to any of the plurality of input feeders.

### DECISION

The decision of the Examiner to reject claims 1-23 is reversed.

### REVERSED

vsh

GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.  
1950 ROLAND CLARKE PLACE  
RESTON, VA 20191